

# **Exhibit 4**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

SIA HENRY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

BROWN UNIVERSITY, et al.,

Defendants.

) Docket No. 22 C 125

) Chicago, Illinois  
) February 8, 2023  
) 9:15 o'clock a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE MATTHEW F. KENNELLY

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

ROCHE FREEDMAN LLP  
BY: MR. EDWARD J. NORMAND  
99 Park Avenue, Suite 1910  
New York, NY 10016  
(646) 970-7513

GILBERT LITIGATORS & COUNSELORS  
BY: MR. ROBERT DEWITT GILBERT  
11 Broadway, Suite 615  
New York, NY 10004  
(646) 448-5269

Court Reporter:

MS. CAROLYN R. COX, CSR, RPR, CRR, FCRR  
Official Court Reporter  
219 S. Dearborn Street, Suite 2102  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 435-5639

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2

3 For the Defendants:  
4 Brown University:

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
BY: MR. JON R. ROELLKE  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 739-5754

6

7 University of  
8 Chicago:

ARNOLD & PORTER  
BY: MR. JAMES L. COOPER  
MR. MICHAEL RUBIN  
555 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004-1202  
(202) 942-5000

10

11

12 Columbia University:

SKADDEN ARPS SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM, LLP CH  
BY: MS. AMY VAN GELDER  
155 North Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606-1720  
(312) 407-0903

14

15

16 Cornell University:

KING & SPALDING  
BY: MR. ZACHARY THOMAS FARDON  
110 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3800  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 995-6333

17

18

19

20

21 Dartmouth College:

JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
BY: MR. DOUGLAS LITVACK  
353 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60654  
(312) 222-9350

22

23

24

25

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 Duke University: GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
3 BY: MR. CHRISTOPHER DEAN DUSSEAU  
4 333 South Grand Avenue  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
6 (213) 229-7855

7 SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN & LEHR LLP  
8 BY: MR. JAMES A. MORSCH  
9 161 North Clark Street, Suite 4200  
10 Chicago, IL 60601  
11 (312) 876-7100

12  
13  
14 Georgetown University: MAYER BROWN LLP  
15 BY: MS. BRITT MARIE MILLER  
16 71 South Wacker Drive  
17 Chicago, IL 60606  
18 (312) 782-0600

19  
20 Northwestern  
21 University: GASS TUREK  
22 BY: MR. SCOTT DAVID STEIN  
23 241 N. Broadway, Ste 300  
24 Milwaukee, WI 53202  
25 (312) 853-7000

18 Vanderbilt University: WHITE & CASE LLP  
19 BY: MR. DAVID H. SUGGS  
20 1221 Avenue of the Americas  
21 New York, NY 10020  
22 (212) 819-8200

23 Yale University: HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
24 BY: MR. CHARLES A. LOUGHLIN  
25 MR. BENJAMIN F. HOLT  
555 Thirteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 637-5661



1 (The following proceedings were had by video:)

2 THE CLERK: Case 22 C 125, Henry v. Brown University.

3 THE COURT: So I know we got, you know, a lot of  
4 people on, most by phone. I'm going to suggest we do this the  
5 way we've done all of them, which is that anybody who wants to  
6 give your name for the record, please do so. But anybody  
7 who's on by phone only, you need to mute your phone right now.  
8 If I have to mute you more than once, I'm going to cut you  
9 off.

10 Okay. So go ahead in terms of people who are on  
11 video that want to give your names.

12 MR. GILBERT: This is Robert D. Gilbert from Gilbert  
13 Litigators and counselors on behalf of the plaintiffs.

14 MR. NORMAND: It's Ted Normand from Freeland Norman  
15 Freeland for the plaintiffs as well, your Honor.

16 MS. MILLER: Your Honor, this is Britt Miller from  
17 Mayer Brown on behalf of Georgetown. We previously sent to  
18 your clerk and to the court reporter a list of all of the  
19 defense counsel who would be appearing on the record today so  
20 we didn't have to do this. If your Honor would like us to  
21 formally appear, we can, but we sent that list.

22 THE COURT: That's great. That covers it. I  
23 appreciate you doing that.

24 Okay. So I'm going to dispense with asking anybody  
25 else for your names at this point. But all I'll ask is that

1 when you talk, just say who you are so the court reporter can  
2 get it down.

3 We have an awful lot to cover and not an eternity to  
4 cover it.

5 So I'll tell you where I actually want to start is  
6 with I think the last set of things that were filed, and that  
7 is the motion by some defendants for entry of an order  
8 regarding the HEA statute and production of certain FAFSA  
9 information. So for the benefit of the court reporter, FAFSA  
10 is F-A-F-S-A, all capitals.

11 I got something on Monday from Cornell, and I'm  
12 hoping the lawyer from Cornell is on here because I don't  
13 understand what you're asking me to do or telling me to do.  
14 You kind of state a position here, but you don't really tell  
15 me what you think I should do. So tell me.

16 MR. FARDON: Your Honor, good morning. Zach Fardon  
17 for Cornell. Your Honor, the reason we filed the position  
18 paper is we do differ from the other defendants only in this  
19 narrow regard. They're asking the Court to enter a finding  
20 that collection of production and use of FAFSA data in this  
21 litigation is part of administration of -- as that term is  
22 used in the HEA. And Cornell's concern is there's no case law  
23 that says that.

24 And unlike the other universities, Cornell does not  
25 believe that such a permissive interpretation of the HEA is

1 necessarily consistent with the limited existing education  
2 department guidance on the issue or the -- yes, sir.

3 THE COURT: So you're just repeating what I already  
4 read. Did you remember my question, Mr. Fardon? So let's  
5 answer that in the next words that come out of your mouth.

6 MR. FARDON: Your Honor, we had submitted an inquiry  
7 to the education department where custodians of that data --

8 THE COURT: Stop. What are you asking me to do? I  
9 mean, you came out and stated your position. I get that. I  
10 understand your position. What are you asking me to do? Are  
11 you asking me to enter -- to not enter an order, to enter some  
12 order different from one that's provided or what?

13 MR. FARDON: Your Honor, we would like either  
14 guidance from the education department or suggest the Court  
15 seek guidance from the education department as to what their  
16 position is.

17 THE COURT: So I'm supposed to ask the education  
18 department what I should do? That's your position? That's  
19 what you just said.

20 MR. FARDON: Your Honor, we have submitted an  
21 inquiry, and we wanted the comfort of knowing what the  
22 education department's position is on this.

23 THE COURT: So your position right now is that it's  
24 not covered, right, that you can't turn this stuff over?  
25 That's got to be your position, otherwise, you wouldn't be

1 asking for guidance.

2 MR. FARDON: That's right, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Okay. So stop. This case was filed in,  
4 when, January a year ago, so it's about 13 months old. And I  
5 went through all of these motions to dismiss. You know,  
6 extensive briefing was filed, and the -- you know, because  
7 it's absolutely 100 percent without question crystal clear  
8 that in order to litigate the case, disclosure of this  
9 information is needed because it goes to the core of what's  
10 alleged.

11 That if your position was what you just said it is, I  
12 should have gotten a motion to dismiss like eight months ago  
13 saying, you got to dismiss the case, Judge, because the  
14 plaintiffs aren't going to be able to get the information  
15 because it's illegal. I never got that motion. So why  
16 shouldn't I just consider you to have forfeited your position?

17 MR. FARDON: Judge, we're only talking about FAFSA  
18 information here, this limited set of data. We're not  
19 objecting to production of relevant financial --

20 THE COURT: So you guys have asked for FAFSA  
21 information from the plaintiffs, haven't you?

22 MR. FARDON: I'm not aware, your Honor. Perhaps  
23 someone else --

24 THE COURT: That's half of the briefing on the stuff  
25 I got to deal with today is you wanting the plaintiffs to

1 provide the FAFSA forms and all the information that underlies  
2 them that they submitted during whatever years in question.  
3 Am I wrong about that?

4 MR. FARDON: I do not believe you're wrong, your  
5 Honor.

6 THE COURT: Okay. So what is -- the prohibition  
7 doesn't apply when it's going the other way?

8 MR. FARDON: It's not that, your Honor. It's that we  
9 can find no precedent, and we are contractual in private -- to  
10 oversee obligations as custodians of this data to the  
11 education department, and we just wanted to raise this  
12 position with the Court.

13 THE COURT: Thanks.

14 Is there anybody on the defense side that agrees with  
15 Cornell's position on this? If so, you need to tell me right  
16 now, whether you're on video or not.

17 MR. RUBIN: Your Honor, this is Michael Rubin from  
18 Arnold Porter for University of Chicago, and I am here to  
19 speak on behalf of the other defendants. And all the other  
20 defendants joined in the motion to have the FAFSA order  
21 entered. That's an answer to your question.

22 THE COURT: Actually, it's not even close to an  
23 answer to my question. My question was real simple. Does  
24 anybody agree with Cornell's position that this material can't  
25 be turned over? So that's a question that can be answered yes

1 or no and so --

2 MR. RUBIN: No, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Okay. So no other defendant agrees with  
4 that.

5 All right. So, basically, Cornell's position is that  
6 I should just put the brakes on the litigation and just sit  
7 back and wait for a federal bureaucracy to respond to an  
8 inquiry that's been made.

9 When did you make the inquiry?

10 MR. FARDON: January 17th, your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Why did you wait so gosh darn long?

12 MR. FARDON: Your Honor, once we identified this  
13 specific concern and couldn't find any precedent for the  
14 concern, we submitted the inquiry.

15 THE COURT: When did you get the request that this --  
16 that would have called for this information? When was that  
17 served?

18 MR. FARDON: I don't have that date handy, your  
19 Honor. I apologize.

20 THE COURT: Somebody? Ballpark.

21 MR. GILBERT: September 19th, your Honor. This is  
22 Robert Gilbert speaking. September 19th, your Honor.

23 THE COURT: That would be four months before,  
24 Mr. Fardon, you guys made the request to the education  
25 department. I mean, seriously, with a straight face, you are

1 telling me that I should wait on this. Well, my view is the  
2 position has been forfeited twice. It's been forfeited once  
3 because the upshot of this position is that the litigation  
4 can't proceed because it's been clear from day one that this  
5 type of information is needed in order to pursue the  
6 litigation. So it should have been raised as part of a motion  
7 to dismiss.

8           Secondly, you forfeited it by waiting four months  
9 after you got the request to even ask the education  
10 department, not even ask me. You waited three more weeks to  
11 do that.

12           So the only other question I have about this one then  
13 is that in the last document that I got, which was from the  
14 plaintiffs, there was a proposed tweak, I guess is what I  
15 would call it, of the draft order. And I have the -- I don't  
16 want to share it because that's just going to be too  
17 cumbersome. I've got the plaintiffs' proposed version of this  
18 up on my screen now.

19           And so my question on the -- to whoever is the  
20 spokesperson for the defense, which seems like it's Mr. Rubin  
21 on this, at least, is do you have any problem with the  
22 proposed tweaks by the plaintiff? And, if so, tell me what I  
23 should untweak and where because I didn't get a redlined  
24 version of it.

25           MR. RUBIN: Yes, we do have a problem, your Honor.

1 We submitted this order for the narrow purpose of getting this  
2 data to the plaintiffs and getting it produced. The  
3 plaintiffs want to address before they've ever seen the data  
4 and ask the Court to hold before ever seeing the data whether  
5 the file that we produce the data in to be produced as  
6 confidential versus highly confidential -- outside eyes only,  
7 attorneys' eyes only.

8 THE COURT: Stop right there. Stop right there. I  
9 don't need to decide that right now. So if that's what the  
10 plaintiff is asking me to do, I don't need to do that. So do  
11 I have a draft order somewhere from the defendants on this?  
12 If you can just tell me when it got sent, because, honestly,  
13 my proposed order in-box is kind of full of orders for this  
14 case.

15 MR. RUBIN: Yes, it was sent at, I believe it was, on  
16 Friday, this past Friday, the 3rd.

17 THE COURT: February 3rd. Okay. All right.

18 MR. RUBIN: Actually, it was technically the 4th,  
19 around 2:00 a.m.

20 THE COURT: Okay. That will be easy to find. All  
21 right. Thanks. All right. That's done on that.

22 Okay. What I want to do next -- I guess I'm going to  
23 kind of try to go back and go through this more or less  
24 sequentially. On most of these -- on some of these, I don't  
25 even have any questions. I'm just going to tell you what the



1 rulings are. That's going to be the case on the one where  
2 there's a whole laundry list of stuff. On some of them, I  
3 have a question or two. And on maybe one or two, I'm going to  
4 need to hear a little bit more argument.

5 So the first one I've got is the dispute about  
6 numbers of depositions and lengths. And so what this boils  
7 down to, as I understand it, is a dispute over whether the  
8 plaintiff gets to do only one or more than one 30(b)(6)  
9 deposition of each defendant.

10 So to me, the way I read the defendant's position, it  
11 kind of seems to assume that there is some sort of a rule or  
12 precedent or whatever that a party only gets one 30(b)(6)  
13 deposition of the other side. It all has to be done at once.  
14 I'll just tell you that that's completely inconsistent with my  
15 experience in complex litigation. But if there's something  
16 that says that somewhere, I'd appreciate somebody on the  
17 defense side telling me what it is.

18 MS. MILLER: Your Honor, Britt Miller for Georgetown.  
19 I think the defendants' position was simply that in order to  
20 be able to meaningfully schedule these, including the  
21 possibility of individual 30(b)(1)s being overlapped with  
22 30(b)(6)s, that the identification of the 30(b)(6) topics are  
23 told to us up front so that we can appropriately prepare a  
24 witness or witnesses and ensure that our witnesses are not  
25 taken in duplicative order; i.e., a 30(b)(6) follows six

1 months after we've done most of the depositions or vice versa  
2 is an interest of efficiencies and to ensure that our clients  
3 are not unduly burdened.

4 THE COURT: Okay. I mean, kind of imbedded within  
5 your answer is it was probably an unintentional concession  
6 that 30(b)(6)s aren't limited to one because you said witness  
7 or witnesses. That's the norm, actually, in complex  
8 litigation is it takes more than one witness. And so by  
9 definition it's not one deposition.

10 So here's the deal. I'm going to limit it to -- I'm  
11 going to limit it to two per defendant. And I'm just going to  
12 say that's a number I am pulling out of the air. Okay? So if  
13 somebody wants to call that arbitrary, you're right. It is.  
14 So that's the adjudication of that dispute.

15 The next one I want to talk about is the subpoenas to  
16 the parents. A couple of questions.

17 So let me just say by way of preface, it seems to me  
18 the question is whether there's anything that's relevant and  
19 not disproportionate. And if that's -- if the answer to those  
20 questions is yes, I'm really not inclined to require the  
21 defendants to go through the plaintiffs' lawyers on this.

22 So the categories are -- there's five of them, as I  
23 understand it. Number one would be financial aid applications  
24 and underlying materials.

25 Number two would be records regarding other forms

1 of -- other forms of financial aid.

2 Three would be documents regarding the payment of  
3 tuition and expenses.

4 Four would be college applications and communications  
5 about them.

6 And five would be documents regarding, quote/unquote,  
7 this litigation.

8 So I will tell you there's a lot of ink spilled I  
9 think in both sides' submission over this whole question about  
10 who's a direct purchaser and what's downstream and all that.  
11 I am -- that strikes me as an issue that's going to have to be  
12 decided on the merits. I am strongly, strongly disinclined to  
13 do that now in the context of deciding a discovery motion. So  
14 I'm inclined to bypass it.

15 So I'm going to start with request No. 5 because  
16 that's an easy one. That's the one about documents regarding  
17 the litigation. And that's a paraphrase, but I see that in  
18 the defendants' submission, which kind of gives the  
19 categories.

20 It's too vague and overbroad. I'm not allowing that  
21 one.

22 Now we're going back to number one, financial aid  
23 applications to the defendant universities. Are we talking  
24 about the FAFSA form? Is that what we're talking about? I  
25 mean, it's been a while since I was in the business of helping

1 kids apply to universities, but, I mean, in the old days, at  
2 least, you submitted a FAFSA form. And some schools had an  
3 additional form that they needed you to submit. So when  
4 you're asking about financial aid applications, can you just  
5 tell me, on the defense side, physically what it is you're  
6 talking about.

7 MR. SUGGS: Your Honor, this is David Suggs for  
8 Vanderbilt. We're talking about whatever form the plaintiff  
9 submitted, as you said. There may be --

10 THE COURT: That's not what I'm asking you. Okay.  
11 So you speak for Vanderbilt. What is it at Vanderbilt? What  
12 do they -- what do people submit?

13 MR. SUGGS: Nowadays, your Honor, it comes through  
14 the college board, and there's a form. So it's filtered  
15 through the third party, and Vanderbilt just kind of gets the  
16 data, not the form directly.

17 THE COURT: And at the time of the lawsuit, which  
18 probably isn't right now, but let's say five years ago or  
19 whatever, was that the case or was it done differently at that  
20 point?

21 MR. SUGGS: I don't know when that became the case.  
22 The plaintiffs are asking for data going back to the '90s. So  
23 there have been changes, but I don't know exactly when the  
24 changes occurred. And we're also asking for other information  
25 including the underlying --

1 THE COURT: Look, look, look. I got an hour and 15  
2 minutes to give you guys, 15 minutes which we've already used.  
3 And we've got about 20 minutes to cover, so I'm really just  
4 going to ask that people just answer the questions I'm asking.  
5 You're now going beyond the question I'm asking.

6 So the short answer is you don't know. My question  
7 is -- can somebody else answer this question? What is it  
8 we're talking about when you're asking for financial aid  
9 applications?

10 MR. RUBIN: Your Honor, this is Michael Rubin for  
11 University of Chicago. When the parents submit the FAFSA,  
12 they get a return copy of it. So that's one form of it. Then  
13 there's the application to the college board called the CSS  
14 Profile. That's another piece of it.

15 THE COURT: Got it.

16 MR. RUBIN: And then some schools have their own  
17 individual one. Chicago has their own private shorter one.

18 THE COURT: That's helpful.

19 Here's my question. Do the schools, the defendants  
20 in this case, in other words, don't you already have this from  
21 these applicants? Whatever they sent in, don't you already  
22 have it?

23 MR. SUGGS: Your Honor, we have it for the  
24 defendants, but we don't have it for other schools to which  
25 the plaintiffs applied. And if any of those schools used

1 customized forms, then we wouldn't have those, even if we have  
2 the FAFSA or CSS Profile. And, again, we don't have the  
3 underlying documents.

4 THE COURT: I thought that this request was for  
5 financial aid applications to the defendant universities.  
6 Does it go -- did I misread it? Does it go beyond that?

7 MR. SUGGS: Your Honor, it does go beyond. It asks  
8 for all documents about the plaintiffs' applications for  
9 financial aid, any decision concerning the application,  
10 documents used in connection with the application.

11 THE COURT: Okay. I'm just trying to get a handle on  
12 it.

13 Okay. So here's the ruling. Okay? I am not, repeat  
14 not, allowing subpoenas for the -- what you refer to as the  
15 underlying materials; in other words, I gather the materials  
16 that would -- that were used to prepare the forms. I think  
17 that is largely, if not entirely, a fishing expedition  
18 regarding whether financial aid applications were truthful or  
19 not. There's no showing that that's likely to be a relevant  
20 issue in this case.

21 Even if so, even if it were, it's extremely  
22 tangential and it's not fair, reasonable, or proportionate for  
23 a non-party to a lawsuit. So you can subpoena the parents for  
24 the materials that were actually submitted to universities,  
25 but that's it. That's request one.

1 Request two, this is the one for other forms of  
2 financial aid. Give me one second here. I just got to  
3 decipher my notes. So on some of these, as I said, I'm just  
4 going to rule.

5 The defendants argue that this is important in order  
6 to compare financial aid offers and that it might show the  
7 non-existence of collusion or the absence of impact of  
8 collusion. I think that has some potential relevance. I  
9 think the same thing about records regarding financial aid  
10 offers from other sources. I'm not buying into the no injury  
11 argument that the defendants make. It's really super thin on  
12 authority. But, nevertheless, I think this information could  
13 have some relevance, so that one is okay.

14 Category No. 3 concerns documents regarding tuition  
15 and other payments. I'm really not understanding the  
16 relevance of this, and the defendants really don't make much  
17 of an effort in this submission to explain it, so that one is  
18 a no.

19 And then the last one is communications regarding  
20 attending -- reasons for attending a particular school or  
21 discussing the pros and cons or the merits -- relative merits  
22 of schools.

23 So the only thing that comes close to hitting the  
24 relevance mark on this -- and by close, I don't mean close --  
25 is that this has a bearing on the relevant market. I just

1 have to say I think the opinions of parents and the students  
2 are unlikely to even be relevant on that. Or if they're  
3 relevant, the probative value of it is quite minimal. You can  
4 certainly ask people what schools they applied to and why, how  
5 they compared them. But basically what you're asking for is  
6 for people to go back in all likelihood into their emails,  
7 going back eight or ten years in some cases, maybe even more.  
8 And I just think it's beyond disproportionate.

9           So the bottom line is the defendants can subpoena the  
10 plaintiffs' parents for their applications -- their -- excuse  
11 me -- the financial aid applications to other schools -- I do  
12 think it's more likely that a parent would have kept that than  
13 a kid -- their financial aid offers from other schools or from  
14 third parties, and that's basically it.

15           Okay. That's the ruling on that one.

16           MR. NORMAND: Your Honor, Ted Normand for the  
17 plaintiffs. I apologize if I missed this. You made an  
18 opening reference to the extent which defendants would be  
19 interacting with the parents.

20           THE COURT: They can subpoena them. They don't have  
21 to go through you.

22           MR. NORMAND: For purposes of the subpoena,  
23 understood, your Honor.

24           THE COURT: Well, I mean, that's all I'm being asked  
25 to decide.



1           Okay. Next item. Okay. So I'm actually going to  
2 skip ahead just in sequence. This is the defendants' motion  
3 to compel. This is the one that basically has the list of  
4 various interrogatories and requests for production.

5           There may be one or two I have questions on, but I  
6 don't think so. So I'm just going to go through. I'm just  
7 going to tell you, it is not likely that I am going to go back  
8 and issue a written ruling on all of this stuff. It's just  
9 going to say granted in part, denied in part, as stated on the  
10 record. So just either take really great notes or order the  
11 transcript.

12           Excuse me one second.

13           Okay. Starting with interrogatories 1 and 2, that's  
14 parallel with something I just talked about. That has to do  
15 with applications for admission and financial aid in documents  
16 regarding other sources of financial aid that was actually  
17 received. Those are enforced for the reasons that I just  
18 discussed on the parents' subpoena.

19           Interrogatory number 3 asks for analysis of the  
20 relevant market. I think that's premature at this point.  
21 It's a contention interrogatory. And contention  
22 interrogatories don't always have to wait until closer to the  
23 end of discovery, but I think that's appropriate here because  
24 everybody who is on this call understands that this is almost  
25 entirely going to come from experts. And it's way too early

1 to make people take a position on that, so I'm not enforcing  
2 interrogatory 3.

3 The rest are requests for production, I'm basically  
4 organizing this. It's not exactly in sequence, but it's in  
5 the sequence they're discussed I think.

6 So the first one is request for production of 1 and  
7 7, documents regarding the reasons the plaintiff applied and  
8 comparing schools. That one -- I think that's relevant, and  
9 so I'm enforcing that one.

10 Documents regarding the relevant market, that's not.  
11 I'm not enforcing that for the reasons I just discussed. I  
12 think one of those is 117. I forget which is which.

13 Request for production 2, applications for admission  
14 to the defendant universities. Okay. This one is actually  
15 just asking for applications for admission to the defendant  
16 universities. I'm trying to figure out why you need to have  
17 the plaintiffs produce that. Don't you already have them?

18 MR. SUGGS: Your Honor, in some cases, as we're  
19 learning in responding to plaintiffs' discovery request, we do  
20 not always have the documents.

21 THE COURT: Really? They don't keep them?

22 MR. SUGGS: Sometimes -- sometimes due to standard  
23 document retention policies, the materials are not retained.

24 THE COURT: Okay. Fine. You told me what I need to  
25 know. That one is enforced. I think it's relevant.

1           Request for production 3, applications for financial  
2 aid, that's essentially parallel to the thing I dealt with on  
3 the parents' subpoena. That's enforced, but just the  
4 applications, not the underlying or supporting documents.

5           Request for production No. 5, this has to do with  
6 third-party scholarships and financial aid from third parties.  
7 Again, I'm not taking a position on this direct purchaser or  
8 downstream issue that's addressed in the briefs. I'm  
9 enforcing this one because I think it could lead to relevant  
10 evidence. I'm not positive of that, but close enough.

11           Request for production 6, this has to be -- this has  
12 to do with documents regarding getting turned down for  
13 financial aid -- no, excuse me -- documents regarding turning  
14 down financial aid offers. That's the way I read it. I'm not  
15 enforcing that one. It's not relevant as it's described.  
16 Anything relevant is otherwise requested and is going to be  
17 produced, as I understand it, namely, financial aid offers  
18 from other institutions. So to the extent that that's within  
19 the scope of 6, that's enforced. Otherwise, it isn't.

20           Request 11 is the next one. My shorthand is  
21 documents regarding the circumstances under which the  
22 plaintiffs got involved in litigation. I think this is  
23 overwhelmingly likely to involve work product or attorney  
24 client privilege. It's pretty tangential at best to any  
25 relevant issue. It's certainly okay to ask about this at

1 depositions, but I'm not going to at this point require  
2 production of documents. You can come back to me on that if  
3 something pops out during a deposition that you think you need  
4 to see.

5 MR. SUGGS: Your Honor, if I could just -- if I may  
6 ask a question?

7 THE COURT: No, you can ask when I'm done.

8 Request for production 12, this is documents  
9 regarding fee arrangements and engagement letters. My  
10 understanding is that plaintiffs undertook to produce  
11 engagement letters. Did that get done? It was supposed to  
12 happen I think on January the 30th. Did that get done?

13 MR. SUGGS: No, your Honor, we have not received  
14 anything from plaintiffs.

15 THE COURT: You have to produce the engagement  
16 letters. But otherwise -- but that's it on that one.

17 Request 18 and 26 are discussed together. These are  
18 records regarding loans and modifications and payment  
19 histories. I'm not seeing the relevance of that. So  
20 basically for the reasons that are discussed in the  
21 plaintiffs' memorandum, so I'm not enforcing that one.

22 Request 19, documents regarding satisfaction with the  
23 institution and the value of the education, it's just the way  
24 it's written, it's overly broad and unduly burdensome given  
25 the breadth of it, so I'm not enforcing that one.

1           19 and 21, these are social media user names and  
2 documents regarding social media. That's a hard no. It's a  
3 fishing expedition, and it's inappropriately intrusive, in my  
4 opinion.

5           Request for production 24, documents -- oh, I'm  
6 sorry. The documents that the plaintiffs say they've agreed  
7 to produce on that, this is page 15 of their response, seems  
8 sufficient to me on that one, so I'm not enforcing it beyond  
9 that.

10           The last one is loan agreements, and for the reason I  
11 said on request 18 and 26, I don't think that's relevant. I'm  
12 not enforcing that. So I'm done with this motion.

13           What was your question?

14           MR. SUGGS: Your Honor, with respect to request 11 --

15           THE COURT: As I said at the beginning, every time  
16 you talk, say your name so the court reporter doesn't have to  
17 go running her cursor across the screen while she's trying to  
18 type.

19           MR. SUGGS: I apologize, your Honor. David Suggs for  
20 Vanderbilt University.

21           This was the request for documents about how the  
22 plaintiffs became involved in the litigation. You stated that  
23 you think --

24           THE COURT: Number 11?

25           MR. SUGGS: Yes, sir. You stated that you think the

1 documents are privileged. All we ask is that --

2 THE COURT: That's not what I said. That is actually  
3 not what I said. I said -- I'll quote you what I said. Give  
4 me a second.

5 What I said was, I think it's overwhelmingly likely  
6 to involve work product or attorney-client privilege, and it's  
7 pretty tangential at best to any relevant issue.

8 That is what I said.

9 MR. SUGGS: Okay, your Honor. Well, our position is  
10 that when they became involved in the litigation --

11 THE COURT: Fine. Look, you filed two briefs on  
12 this. I considered your position. I considered your  
13 position. I'm not holding oral argument on this. You filed  
14 two briefs. That was one more than the plaintiffs filed. I  
15 ruled on it.

16 All right. So we're going to go on to the next  
17 thing. That is -- hang on a second. Pardon me. The next one  
18 is the motion by Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Northwestern,  
19 Notre Dame, and Yale for a protective order.

20 So now we're getting into kind of more heavy  
21 questions I think here.

22 So I want to start off asking the plaintiff a couple  
23 of things here, plaintiffs, a couple of things here. So can  
24 you give me -- and it's been done in other places, and maybe  
25 to some extent in briefing on this. But can you give me kind

1 of a nutshell explanation for how the contention that  
2 admissions, at least some admissions, are tied to donations  
3 bears on your antitrust claim.

4 MR. GILBERT: This is Robert Gilbert, your Honor.  
5 That's a fairly broad question, as I understand it.

6 THE COURT: Basically what I'm asking you to do is  
7 explain the relevance of the information about donations and  
8 trying to link that to admissions.

9 MR. GILBERT: The culpability of -- as your Honor has  
10 ruled on August 15th, the culpability --

11 THE COURT: Stop. Stop. I know what I ruled. I'm  
12 just -- I have a reason for doing this, so let's just answer  
13 my question without giving me the entire history of time.

14 MR. GILBERT: Okay. It's relevant because the  
15 admissions that were wrongdoing at Dartmouth, for example, are  
16 evidence of the liability of Georgetown and every other  
17 defendant.

18 THE COURT: You're missing my question. Let's say --  
19 I'm just talking about on an individual basis. Let's just  
20 stick with Dartmouth. Okay? So how does -- let's say just  
21 hypothetically that Dartmouth had a practice of giving  
22 enhanced consideration or automatic admission to high-level  
23 donor's kids. Okay? How would that bear on your proof of  
24 Dartmouth's liability for the antitrust conspiracy? Put all  
25 the 568 issues to the side for now.

1 MR. GILBERT: Okay. It would show that as to just  
2 Dartmouth that Dartmouth was not entitled to an exemption and  
3 that it's a pure price fixing collusion case. But it would  
4 also show that every other defendant is liable on the same  
5 basis.

6 THE COURT: I get the every other thing. You don't  
7 need to keep going into it. So the reason it would show that  
8 that particular school was not entitled to an exemption is  
9 what exactly? I'm not arguing with you. I'm just asking you  
10 to explain it.

11 MR. GILBERT: If I understood your question, your  
12 Honor, the question is -- I'm sorry. I'm going to have to ask  
13 you to repeat it.

14 THE COURT: What does it show? In other words, if a  
15 school is tying some admissions to high-level donations, why  
16 does that help show that that school is not entitled to a 568  
17 exemption? Because --

18 MR. GILBERT: Okay. Now I understand the question.  
19 I think I understand the question better, your Honor. I  
20 apologize.

21 THE COURT: I just answered it. It was my answer,  
22 right, because they're not need-blind, right?

23 MR. GILBERT: They're not need-blind. And  
24 "need-blind" means all applicants are admitted, all admittees  
25 are admitted without regard to the financial circumstances of



1 the student or the student's family. That's for the whole  
2 conspiracy.

3 THE COURT: Pause. I got my answer. I pretty much  
4 had to give it myself, but that's okay.

5 Now I'm going to go onto my next hypothetical  
6 question. Let's say that every defendant in the case dropped  
7 the 568 defense, every defendant drops the 568 defense. Would  
8 the donations tied to admissions, quote/unquote, evidence  
9 still be relevant, and, if so, why?

10 MR. GILBERT: This is an interesting hypothetical,  
11 your Honor. If every defendant dropped it and they admitted  
12 that they had violated the exemption --

13 THE COURT: I'm a law professor. Okay? Let's just  
14 pretend. You don't get to change the law professor's  
15 hypothetical.

16 MR. GILBERT: If they dropped it, then we'd have --  
17 every single one dropped it, we'd have a pure price fixing  
18 standard collusion case in which they've already admitted they  
19 have a formula.

20 THE COURT: You probably wouldn't need it in that  
21 situation, right? "It" being the donations tied to  
22 information, tied to admission.

23 MR. GILBERT: My initial response to that  
24 hypothetical is we would not need it if every single defendant  
25 dropped the defense and then this was a pure price fixing

1 formula case.

2 THE COURT: They haven't. They haven't dropped the  
3 defense. It's just these six. And how many defendants total  
4 do you have in the case?

5 MR. GILBERT: 17.

6 THE COURT: There's another 11 or so that haven't  
7 dropped it yet.

8 Okay. Thanks.

9 So my next question is, and this is a more  
10 particularized question, as it does relate to the motion.  
11 It's not a hypothetical. So part of the thrust of this motion  
12 is that, hey, wait a second, we -- we dropped the defense. We  
13 don't agree with the argument that if one did it, everybody  
14 gets hooked in, but put that to the side. You got 11 other  
15 schools you can get this stuff from. You don't really need to  
16 get it from us too, and we ought to get something out of  
17 having dropping this defense. It's kind of like a  
18 proportionality argument.

19 And that's probably putting it more directly than  
20 it's put in the motion, but I guess I'd like to get the  
21 plaintiffs' take on that. Basically, it's an argument by  
22 these six schools, hey, we did something here. We dropped the  
23 defense. We should give some credit for that. You can get  
24 this information from other schools. You don't really need it  
25 from us too because --

1 MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, let me respond in three  
2 levels. The first is to slightly amend what I said before.  
3 They're still asserting a statute of limitations defense.  
4 Okay? If the 17 are still asserting a statute of limitations  
5 defense, that means there was -- they say we should have known  
6 to file a complaint earlier, which means we should have known  
7 that there was wrongdoing that they were concealing. So we're  
8 still entitled to find out what they were doing and how they  
9 were hiding it. So even if they -- all 17 dropped the --

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MR. GILBERT: That's the first point.

12 The second point is, as to the other schools, we have  
13 substantial basis to believe that these six schools are the  
14 most culpable. I'll just give you three examples, your Honor.  
15 And it would be the most efficient to just establish this,  
16 that the conspiracy was not need-blind.

17 The first is that Brown has sent a letter that was  
18 produced on -- let's see -- I guess it was December 16th. And  
19 the letter admits that they were need aware as to transfer  
20 students and admits that the other conspirators, all of them,  
21 were need aware as to wait list students. So getting -- Brown  
22 is the best place to go. Okay? And they're one of the people  
23 that filed the motion.

24 The second example, Yale, months after the filing of  
25 the complaint, was the subject of an exposé in which Russian

1 oligarch billionaires were making substantial donations to  
2 Yale in exchange for their kids getting admitted to Yale.  
3 Okay? That's another reason why it would be very efficient to  
4 go to these rather than see what we could find at the other  
5 11.

6 A third example would be Northwestern. Actually, I  
7 want to do four, if you don't mind. Northwestern, there was a  
8 student newspaper article that the president had reviewed and  
9 spoken to the admissions office about 550 applications in one  
10 year, most of which related to donors. Okay? It would be  
11 much more efficient to just have discovery about that than to  
12 chase around 11 other defendants.

13 The final example I say is Dartmouth. Dartmouth had  
14 a senior official whose last name was Sassorossi, whose job  
15 for years was to coordinate fundraising and admissions. So  
16 the most efficient way for us to establish the liability of  
17 the conspiracy and the violation that we have a strong statute  
18 of limitations argument, because they were hiding what they  
19 were doing, okay, is to go to these defendants, your Honor.

20 THE COURT: Let me push back in this way. First with  
21 a question. Understood on these six defendants. Are you  
22 asking from the six the same information or what?

23 MR. GILBERT: We're asking for the information about  
24 their violation of need-blind.

25 THE COURT: Okay. I'm being very specific in what

1 I'm asking -- let me be very clear on what I'm asking. When I  
2 say "this information," what I mean is information that would  
3 assist you in determining whether admissions were tied to  
4 donations. Are you asking for that from the other 11?

5 MR. GILBERT: Yes. And as to your question about  
6 getting something -- I want to do it in response to your  
7 question about getting something.

8 THE COURT: No, no, no. Hang on. What you told me a  
9 second ago was that it's most efficient to go to these six. I  
10 get that. They're the major malefactors of what you're  
11 contending, in other words, but you're also going to the other  
12 11. So it's kind of hard to swallow it's the most efficient  
13 argument if you're doing it from everybody.

14 MR. GILBERT: Well, your Honor, we had actually  
15 addressed what you said as sort of a proportionality. We had  
16 made a compromise offer that we want to take the depositions  
17 of six specific people. We're authorized to take ten  
18 depositions at every defendant. Okay? And we said, no, we  
19 just want six specific individuals for depositions on this  
20 issue.

21 THE COURT: You're deciding them by title or by  
22 function, I'm assuming?

23 MR. GILBERT: Mr. Sassorossi, his job was to --

24 THE COURT: You don't need to give me the details.

25 MR. GILBERT: But you understand the point, I'm sure,

1 your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Who is going to address this on  
3 the defense side?

4 MR. LITVACK: Your Honor, Doug Litvack for Dartmouth.

5 THE COURT: You're just going to need to keep your  
6 voice up because since you're so far away from the mic, it  
7 sounds like you're talking from the bottom of a barrel.

8 MR. LITVACK: Sure. I'll keep my voice up. I  
9 apologize for that.

10 THE COURT: By the way, that is great art in the  
11 background. You win the background contest for today.

12 MR. LITVACK: I'll be sure to let the firm know that,  
13 your Honor.

14 Your Honor, to Mr. Gilbert's point, I just want to  
15 address a few things that Mr. Gilbert said. First,  
16 Mr. Gilbert is conflating the exemption with liability. Those  
17 are two distinct issues in this case. There's antitrust  
18 liability, which he conceded has nothing to do with admission  
19 practices. And then there's the narrow question of the  
20 exemption.

21 And, your Honor, you spent a good amount of time in  
22 the motion to dismiss order interpreting the exemption and  
23 giving us guidance on what the exemption means. And it's a  
24 binary question. It's a very simple binary question of  
25 whether schools' need admissions process consider an

1 applicant's financial circumstances in making an admissions  
2 decision.

3 And the scope of discovery the plaintiff seeks is  
4 completely, grossly disproportionate to the needs of the case.  
5 They're seeking here, your Honor, 73 RFPs, and we put in our  
6 declarations what that would entail in terms of work. Those  
7 documents seek 25 years of information, hundreds of thousands  
8 of documents --

9 THE COURT: Time -- time out. Time out.

10 MR. LITVACK: -- that's millions of dollars of  
11 additional expense --

12 THE COURT: This motion doesn't talk about all 73.  
13 So let's just talk about what this motion talks about.

14 MR. LITVACK: Your Honor, respectfully, it does talk  
15 about all 73. Yes.

16 THE COURT: All 73, every one of the 73 is covered by  
17 this motion?

18 MR. LITVACK: Correct, your Honor. Let me just  
19 explain what we're asking for here. Your Honor, we're asking  
20 for here a protective order from the discovery -- the grossly  
21 disproportionate discovery the plaintiff seeks. We're not  
22 saying that no discovery from us on these issues is  
23 appropriate. However, the discovery that the plaintiffs are  
24 currently seeking is completely disproportionate, and  
25 Mr. Gilbert's compromise that he discussed, he didn't tell --

1 he failed to tell that they're seeking production of 37 of the  
2 73 RFPs, doesn't meaningfully reduce the burden. We didn't  
3 have any issue with the depositions. We had an issue with  
4 spending millions of dollars and significant time and effort  
5 for a defense that we're not asserting. And, frankly, there's  
6 easier, more targeted ways to get the information that the  
7 plaintiffs need for this narrow question.

8 THE COURT: Okay. So time out here. I'm just  
9 looking at the request for production. So I understood this  
10 motion as basically saying, don't make us, the six movants,  
11 produce information about donations to the school and linkage  
12 of that with admissions. Did I misread the motion?

13 MR. LITVACK: You did, your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Okay. It wouldn't be the first time I've  
15 done that.

16 MR. LITVACK: It's also about admissions practices as  
17 well, your Honor. Admission practices are equally as relevant  
18 to plaintiffs' antitrust claim, as Mr. Gilbert explained.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Give me just a second here. I  
20 just want to pull up something.

21 Bear with me.

22 So I guess maybe my problem is that nothing in your  
23 memorandum tells me what the limitations are that you're  
24 looking at. And the bulk of the discussion is under -- what I  
25 see as the discussion is under heading II, Roman numeral II,



1 which says: "Discovery into admissions and development  
2 activities of the moving defendants is not relevant to the  
3 merits of the plaintiffs' claim or the statute of limitations  
4 defense."

5 And so I guess I read that, you know -- you will  
6 excuse me if I read it kind of consistently with the title,  
7 Admissions and Development Activities, as this motion was more  
8 or less targeted into the linkage between those two things.  
9 And there's really nothing in the memorandum, which I'll just  
10 point out is 15 pages that says, here's specifically what you  
11 want me to do.

12 So just from kind of a consumer standpoint, me being  
13 the consumer, that's a little problematic. So can you tell me  
14 in a nutshell what you want me to do?

15 MR. LITVACK: Yes, your Honor. We want you to issue  
16 a protective order that prohibits plaintiffs from enforcing  
17 compliance of the 73 RFPs that were attached to our motion as  
18 Exhibit C and -- so we're willing to entertain more targeted,  
19 lesser forms of discovery --

20 THE COURT: So your proposal is strike everything,  
21 and we start over. And we'll talk to you. That's what I got  
22 from what you just said. Did I get it right?

23 MR. LITVACK: No, no, no, your Honor. No, your  
24 Honor.

25 THE COURT: Okay. I don't want to paraphrase. Let

1 me read back to you what you said to me.

2 We want you to issue a protective order that  
3 prohibits plaintiffs from enforcing compliance of the 73 RFPs  
4 that were attached to our motion, and we're willing to  
5 entertain more targeted, lesser forms of discovery.

6 So what -- how would a person in my shoes understand  
7 that other than what I just said? Strike everything and start  
8 over, and we'll talk to you. That's what you told me.

9 MR. LITVACK: Sorry, your Honor. Sorry, I didn't  
10 mean to speak over you.

11 I didn't finish the part of what we're asking for  
12 was --

13 THE COURT: I didn't interrupt you. I didn't  
14 interrupt you.

15 MR. LITVACK: We're willing to submit, as our motion  
16 suggested, written interrogatories as well as produce  
17 documents sufficient to show whether our clients' admissions  
18 departments did or did not consider an applicant's financial  
19 circumstances in any way in making admissions decisions. We  
20 think those two things will give the plaintiffs the discovery  
21 they want related to the exemption and will be  
22 proportionate --

23 THE COURT: Stop. Stop. What you just said, what  
24 you said, where do I find that in the memorandum in support of  
25 the motion? I guess it's just -- it's a motion. It's kind of

1 a speaking motion. Just point to me where I find that in the  
2 motion because I guess I must have missed it. So tell me  
3 where it is. I've got it pulled up in front of me.

4 MR. LITVACK: Your Honor, you didn't miss it in the  
5 motion.

6 THE COURT: Because it's not in there. Because it's  
7 not in there. I mean, seriously, folks. You guys gave me  
8 like, you know, the book that I put together of all of this  
9 stuff, I'm just going to tell you how many pages it's got in  
10 it. 645 pages of all the stuff -- 645. That doesn't count  
11 the 40-page status report from back in January. I mean,  
12 what's the planet on which you don't put in your motion --  
13 your 15-page motion for protective order exactly what you're  
14 asking me to do? It's not this one. It's not the planet  
15 Earth. Okay?

16 So basically when I asked you, point blank, tell me  
17 what you want me to do, you said, don't make us respond to the  
18 73 RFPs. And we're willing to entertain more targeted, lesser  
19 forms of discovery. Translation, that's the only reasonable  
20 translation of what you told me is strike the 73 RFPs. And if  
21 you want to serve something else, we'll think about it. We're  
22 willing to entertain it. That's just not a viable  
23 alternative. And it's not in your motion. It's not in your  
24 motion.

25 Here's the deal. I'm about ten seconds here from

1 just striking the motion because it doesn't describe the  
2 relief you're asking for. So you get one more chance to tell  
3 me why I shouldn't do that.

4 MR. LITVACK: Your Honor, in the motion, we do  
5 request a protective order from all 73 RFPs. That's the  
6 relief that we're seeking, your Honor.

7 THE COURT: Again, I'm going to ask you where in the  
8 motion does it say that?

9 MS. VAN GELDER: Your Honor, this is Amy Van Gelder.

10 THE COURT: No, no. I am talking to a particular  
11 person here. I am sorry. I'm going to deal with the person  
12 who is talking to me here, who has taken up the last  
13 12 minutes of my life that I'm never going to get back. Okay?  
14 So tell me where in the motion I find it. I'm not saying it's  
15 not in there. I just want you to tell me where I can find it  
16 so I can look at it in black and white.

17 MR. LITVACK: Your Honor, it's -- first of all, it's  
18 in the conclusion on page 15. And then we reference in the  
19 introduction of the motion.

20 THE COURT: The conclusion on 15 says: "For the  
21 foregoing reasons, the Court should grant this motion and  
22 enter the proposed protective order as to the moving  
23 defendant."

24 So it basically refers me to something else. That's  
25 not containing it within the confines of the motion. Where is

1 it in the motion?

2 MR. LITVACK: Your Honor, it's on page 3 on the  
3 last -- I'll just read it out loud, your Honor.

4 "Accordingly, the moving defendants seek a protective  
5 order precluding discovery from the moving defendants with  
6 respect to admissions and development activities including  
7 through requests for production and search terms identified in  
8 Exhibit C to Exhibit 1 of the motion."

9 It's in --

10 THE COURT: Time out. Again, when you file stuff  
11 with a judge, okay, and you guys -- I mean, it's kind of a  
12 foregone conclusion in any litigation that the judge is the  
13 person who knows the least about it. The parties know about  
14 it. The lawyers for the parties know about it. I know what  
15 you told me. Okay? So here's what you told me in the thing  
16 that you just read, which is the last sentence of the full  
17 paragraph on page 3:

18 A protective order precluding discovery from the  
19 moving defendants "with respect to their admissions and  
20 development activities," including through the requests for  
21 production and search terms identified in Exhibit C to  
22 Exhibit 1.

23 So, again, the last part of that refers me to  
24 something else, and when I read this about admissions and  
25 development activities, since the thrust of most of the actual

1 discussion had to do with contributions to the university, I  
2 read the "and" as meaning and, linkage, in other words. You  
3 didn't explain otherwise.

4 So now I'm actually going to go look at -- if I can  
5 find it -- Exhibit C to Exhibit 1. Exhibit C to Exhibit 1.

6 So Exhibit C to Exhibit 1 is a spreadsheet -- it's a  
7 19-page spreadsheet. It gives a bunch of search terms in it.  
8 Honestly, again, that doesn't tell me -- okay. This has kind  
9 of been a waste of 20 -- we're now up to about 20 minutes.  
10 It's kind of been a waste of 20 minutes.

11 So, look, I'm not going to make the plaintiffs go  
12 back over from scratch. I'm just not. That's number one.

13 Number two, part of the reason why I'm not going to  
14 make the plaintiffs go back to scratch is that unless  
15 everybody withdraws the defense, which they have not, it's  
16 seven out of -- or 6 out of 17, which is something like 33  
17 percent or something like that, maybe 35 percent. It's  
18 hornbook law of conspiracy, or at least the way this  
19 conspiracy is defined and the way the exemption works is that  
20 if other defendants -- and I already ruled on this in the  
21 motion to dismiss. To the extent that what I'm about to say  
22 varies from the motion to dismiss, I'm not intending that.  
23 Basically says that everybody within the alleged group has to  
24 have been complying with 568 in order for anybody to take  
25 advantage of it.

1           Okay. Now, you might openly convince me that that's  
2 not right. But as of right now, that's the operative  
3 complaint and what it says and at least part of the basis on  
4 which I sustained it. So the proposition that by some but not  
5 all defendants withdrawing the defense, you've essentially  
6 removed yourselves from the need to provide discovery on these  
7 points really is not accurate. It's not right. It's  
8 incorrect. And I'm not even thinking about the statute of  
9 limitations issue.

10           If I had gotten a more targeted motion here -- which  
11 I kind of thought I had, but I guess I didn't -- that says,  
12 you know, limit it in various ways, I would have considered  
13 it, but you haven't done that. And I don't think you've made  
14 the case on disproportionality. The information is relevant.  
15 The motion is denied.

16           Next.

17           MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, may I address one more  
18 issue regarding if the 17 withdrew the defense?

19           THE COURT: So wait a second. I just ruled in your  
20 favor on the motion.

21           MR. GILBERT: Right, right.

22           THE COURT: Are you going to try to talk me out of  
23 it?

24           MR. GILBERT: We're delighted by that, your Honor.  
25 But I would like --

1 THE COURT: What do I need to hear about it then?

2 MR. GILBERT: That's fine, your Honor.

3 THE COURT: No, I don't need to hear more about it.

4 So I think now we're over to the stuff in the status  
5 report. And let me check my time here. So we're down to  
6 basically about our last 10 or 12 minutes that I've got for  
7 this.

8 Okay. I'm looking at the January 13th status report.  
9 Bear with me. I'm pulling it up.

10 A question for the plaintiffs: On page 28 of the  
11 status report -- and it would be helpful if you could look at  
12 that -- there's a paragraph that says: "Plaintiffs also have  
13 less burdensome avenues of discovery available to determine  
14 whether an applicant's financial circumstances influenced the  
15 decision of an admissions officer. For example, some  
16 defendants have proposed that before adding these custodians,  
17 plaintiffs propound interrogatories relating to defendants'  
18 admissions policies or conduct a 30(b)(6) deposition of an  
19 individual in the admissions office to determine if donations  
20 are considered as part of admissions decisions."

21 So that kind of sounds like a good idea to me.  
22 What's wrong with it?

23 MR. GILBERT: Two things, your Honor. I might be  
24 mistaken, but I believe there's only a very small minority  
25 that have actually proposed that. But more fundamentally, the



1 records of interest are not in the admissions office. The  
2 records that show the tying of the donation and the admissions  
3 is where the deal was made, and the deal was made between the  
4 development office and the donor or by the president of the  
5 university and the donor. That's why Morton Schapiro of  
6 Northwestern looked at 550 applications and spoke to the  
7 admissions office about it. He could tell them orally, which  
8 is certainly strongly implied by the article of the  
9 Northwestern student newspaper that that's what he did. He  
10 told the admissions office orally what to do.

11 So the real records tying the donation to the deal  
12 are not in the admissions office.

13 THE COURT: Why wouldn't there be in that situation?  
14 I mean, wouldn't there be like a notation in the file or  
15 something like that, that the president of the university  
16 said, admit this person?

17 MR. GILBERT: There may be -- you're absolutely  
18 right, your Honor. There may very well be, "Schapiro said  
19 admit." Okay? We then miss all the why he said admit. Okay?  
20 What was the basis? How much money donated? And what was the  
21 negotiation of the donation?

22 THE COURT: Again, the proposal isn't that instead of  
23 adding these custodians. The proposal, as I read it, is  
24 before adding these custodians, "the custodians" being the  
25 ones in the development and the president's office.

1 MR. GILBERT: All right. Well --

2 THE COURT: I mean, in other words, let's say  
3 university X, somebody, you know, that qualifies as a 30(b)(6)  
4 deponent or, you know, by their title or by, you know, being  
5 educated about it or whatever comes in and says, it's never --  
6 I guess -- apparently, if I'm reading this stuff right, MIT is  
7 going to say this. It's never happened in recorded history  
8 that we've been told by the development office or the  
9 president's office to give more weight to this person or admit  
10 this person or look at their application again or anything  
11 like that.

12 So, I mean, I -- that's the way I'm reading this is  
13 that before you tell them, okay, go look in the admission --  
14 go look in the development and the president's office, let's  
15 at least find out if there's some basis to believe that those  
16 kind of communications coming from one of those two places or  
17 both of them are happening.

18 MR. GILBERT: As long as we're not excluding these  
19 custodians, I think that's going to, your Honor, very much  
20 extend the life of the discovery because we think we know  
21 exactly where to go. As we said, we think we have six names  
22 where we think we could prove this, take six depositions, and  
23 be done with it. To go through the admissions office --

24 THE COURT: You better watch out how many times you  
25 say that.

1 MR. GILBERT: Okay. In terms of efficiency, we think  
2 that's the most efficient way to go, rather than go to people  
3 who, at most, may have received a note --

4 THE COURT: What if I were to say, fine, rather  
5 than -- at least initially, rather than sending, you know,  
6 putting the development and the president's office and all 17  
7 schools on the custodian list, if you've got these six people  
8 that you want to depose, you know, ask for their records.

9 MR. GILBERT: I believe we've asked for that, your  
10 Honor.

11 THE COURT: I understand. But, I mean, in other  
12 words, let's pause the rest of it.

13 MR. GILBERT: That would be -- that would be  
14 acceptable to us, your Honor, that if we had those six --

15 THE COURT: So thanks. You said "acceptable." I'll  
16 take a yes.

17 So let me turn over to the defense side here. So the  
18 proposal on the table is pause generally the inclusion of the  
19 president and development office among the custodians with the  
20 exemption of these six -- I forget which ones they are -- the  
21 six institutions that plaintiffs' counsel is talking about,  
22 Mr. Gilbert. So somebody from the six that wants to answer  
23 that.

24 MR. DUSSEAUT: Your Honor, do you want to hear from  
25 someone from the six? This is Chris Dusseault. I'm the one

1 addressing the issue more generally of the compromised  
2 proposal.

3 THE COURT: It probably makes sense for somebody from  
4 one of the six to answer that, I think, given what the  
5 suggestion is that I put on the table.

6 MR. ROELLKE: Your Honor, it's Jon Roellke for Brown  
7 University. I think that proposal kind of stands us on its  
8 head and that --

9 THE COURT: That's what I thought you were going to  
10 say is that should be -- since we withdrew a defense, we  
11 should have less stuff, not more, and now we're getting more.

12 MR. ROELLKE: Yeah, precisely, your Honor. And I  
13 think the proposition that the plaintiffs assert that they  
14 already have dispositive evidence that those six or the folks  
15 that they want to depose engaged in not need-blind practices  
16 proves too much. If they already have the evidence, I don't  
17 know why they need more. And certainly with respect --

18 THE COURT: Have you ever heard of testimony? I  
19 mean, as opposed to an article in a student newspaper? You  
20 get that, right? What you just said proves too much.

21 MR. ROELLKE: Your Honor, my point being that to --  
22 and we aren't asking the plaintiffs to start from scratch on  
23 this. This relates solely to the issue of whether or not  
24 they're entitled to discovery of need-blind practices for  
25 purposes of the exemption. There's 140 document requests, 73

1 of which relate solely to the application of the exemption.  
2 And those are the requests that we are seeking to foreclose  
3 the plaintiffs --

4 THE COURT: I've ruled on that motion. We're talking  
5 about something else now. Seriously.

6 MR. ROELLKE: Well, it relates to the question of  
7 whether or not discovery of entity of schools that do not rely  
8 on the exemption is appropriate. And if what the proposal on  
9 the table is that discovery of the schools that have moved for  
10 a protective order should in the first instance be limited to  
11 a deposition and not preceded by the 73 different document  
12 requests that relate to the application --

13 THE COURT: Okay. So let me just give you a  
14 hypothetical which probably isn't all that hypothetical.  
15 Let's say we did that. And so Mr. Gilbert lays a subpoena on  
16 the president of Northwestern. I don't know if he's still a  
17 president or not. Let's just assume he is. Lays a subpoena  
18 on the president of Northwestern. Says, okay, what about it,  
19 Mr. So-and-So, or Dr. So-and-so? Did you say this? I don't  
20 remember.

21 What about -- did you ever, you know, put in a call  
22 or send any kind of communication to the admission office  
23 about, you know, an applicant whose family had given a lot of  
24 money? Well, I don't remember.

25 Did you do it with regard to -- and then he quotes

1 something from out of the student newspaper? I don't recall  
2 one way or another.

3 We all know stuff like that is going to happen. It  
4 might not be a hundred percent across the board. We're  
5 talking about -- just by definition, we're talking about stuff  
6 that happened 8, 10, 12, maybe more years ago. People aren't  
7 going to remember. You're talking about busy people who've  
8 got -- it's kind of like a judge or a lawyer. They've got 57  
9 things they're doing. This is one of them. They're not going  
10 to remember details of that.

11 So, I mean, unless you were willing to say, okay, so  
12 if -- I tell Gilbert, okay, Gilbert, you got to go take these  
13 six depositions, just do it with what you've got right now.  
14 Unless you're willing to say, on the defense side, if we get  
15 any "I don't know" out of those depositions, then I'm going  
16 to let them go back and get the documents and then make the  
17 person appear again to answer the questions they didn't  
18 remember the first time. Unless you're willing to say that,  
19 in other words, agree that the person could sit for a second  
20 deposition if they don't recall something significant, which  
21 I'm betting you won't do, that's my bet, then what are we  
22 talking about? Would you do that? Would you agree to that?

23 MR. ROELLKE: Your Honor, I understood the proposal  
24 to be that in order to --

25 THE COURT: No, no, no, don't respond to somebody

1 else's question. Respond to mine. Seriously. It's not one  
2 of those Sunday morning talk shows where, you know, George  
3 Stephanopoulos asks a question and then whoever is answering  
4 it just gives their talking points. That's not the way it  
5 works. It's a real question and answer. You have to actually  
6 answer the question. So it's my question. Just answer it.

7 MR. ROELLKE: And I don't understand how that would  
8 solve the proportionality problem that we're trying to  
9 address.

10 THE COURT: Here's how it would solve it, because you  
11 just said that, hey, if he's got these six smoking guns here,  
12 just take those depositions and be done with it. And don't  
13 make us cough up the documents. So my comeback was what  
14 happens if one of those people doesn't remember something  
15 that's significant? Would you be willing to make him sit for  
16 a second time and get the documents in between? That's the  
17 question I asked you, and you basically answered me with a  
18 non-answer twice. Let's try for three.

19 MR. ROELLKE: I just speak for Brown University, your  
20 Honor. To the extent that the plaintiffs want to take a  
21 deposition of Brown University --

22 THE COURT: We have somebody who is signed in from  
23 two devices in the same room. That's why we're getting the  
24 echo. So if you did that, please turn off the second device.

25 Thanks. Go ahead.

1 MR. ROELLKE: For Brown University, if the plaintiffs  
2 forego what we believe to be oppressive and burdensome  
3 document discovery in exchange for a deposition to address the  
4 issues that we think are disproportionate, we would -- and  
5 that witness did not provide sufficient facts to satisfy the  
6 plaintiffs as to particular questions, we would then be  
7 prepared to pursue the document discovery that, again -- if it  
8 was proportional -- and permit that witness to be deposed  
9 again as to those documents.

10 THE COURT: I think I counted five hedges in there.  
11 Who represents Northwestern?

12 Mr. Stein. Okay. Since the hypothetical concerned  
13 the president of Northwestern, what's your view about this?  
14 You're muted right now. I can't hear you. You're muted.

15 MR. STEIN: I'm sorry, your Honor. Can you hear me?

16 THE COURT: There you go. Yes.

17 MR. STEIN: Scott Stein. The lead for Northwestern.  
18 Just to answer one question you articulated,

19 Mr. Schapiro is now the former president of Northwestern.

20 THE COURT: I kind of thought that, yeah. Okay.  
21 Right.

22 MR. STEIN: But if I understand -- if I'm  
23 understanding correctly what your Honor is proposing -- we  
24 heard you on the protective order motion. Our concern, if  
25 there's going to be discovery on these issues, is to make it



1 proportional, right? And to the point that this is really a  
2 binary issue and the issue that the plaintiffs are focused on  
3 is, is there evidence that schools, Northwestern and other  
4 schools, considered the financial circumstances of certain  
5 students or families, then what your Honor is proposing seems  
6 a reasonable way to get at that.

7           In other words -- and Mr. Schapiro, by the way,  
8 President Schapiro, Former President Schapiro, was also the  
9 vice chair of the 568 group. He's going to be deposed.  
10 There's no question he's going to be deposed. And I have  
11 little doubt that in a deposition, the plaintiffs would be  
12 able to get the evidence that they'll argue is sufficient for  
13 them to make the arguments they want to make on the  
14 applicability of the 568 exemption. I hear you. If there's a  
15 lot of "I don't knows," of course, I can't say they have to be  
16 bound in advance.

17           But I think we would be able to make a strong showing  
18 after such a deposition that they have what they need, as  
19 they've articulated today. And we don't need to produce  
20 20 years of donor records and admissions data. Let's do this  
21 quickly, efficiently. And I think that will be -- frankly, I  
22 think that will satisfy both sides' concerns.

23           MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, may I address that, please?  
24 This is Robert Gilbert.

25           THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.

1 MR. GILBERT: The other point that has not been  
2 raised is the admissions decisions and whether it was wealth  
3 favoritism applies to whether the per se rule or the rule of  
4 reason or Brown doctrine applies. In the Brown case about the  
5 overlap group, the key issue was were the universities  
6 altruistic or were they revenue maximizing. If they engage in  
7 wealth favoritism, that would be another indication that they  
8 were not purely altruistic, which was the standard in the  
9 Brown case, but instead revenue maximizing. So that's another  
10 area of why this is important even if 17 conceded that the --  
11 on the -- the exemption does not apply.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Folks, you've kind of reached the  
13 end of my available time for this. So I'm going to -- I guess  
14 what I'm going to do is kind of apply a hopefully somewhat  
15 sharpened meat ax approach. That would be m-e-a-t, a-x,  
16 approach. And I know that this isn't directly teed up with  
17 what we're talking about.

18 So right now, if I'm counting right, between the  
19 first and second document requests that the plaintiffs served,  
20 there's 179 requests for production, 173 plus 6. Is there a  
21 third or fourth, or is that the universe right now? Just yes  
22 or no? Somebody say yes or no on the plaintiffs' side or on  
23 the defense side.

24 MR. GILBERT: There is a third.

25 THE COURT: How many are in the third? Just ballpark

1 it. 10, 20, 30, 40, 150?

2 MR. STEIN: I think it's much closer to 20.

3 MR. GILBERT: 13.

4 THE COURT: Okay. So that takes us up to 192.

5 So here's what I'm doing. Did I put -- was there any  
6 kind of -- in the earlier orders, did I say you get this many  
7 interrogatories and this many RFPs?

8 MR. STEIN: Yes.

9 THE COURT: What was the number?

10 MR. STEIN: 45 interrogatories. I don't believe  
11 there was a limit on number of RFPs.

12 THE COURT: There is now. So you get to pick your  
13 best 100. You get to pick your best 100.

14 And as far as adding the development and president's  
15 office as custodians, I'm putting the pause on that for now.  
16 For now. We're going to readdress that in a couple of months  
17 once stuff is actually getting produced. I have to get this  
18 thing off the dime. So we're going to put the pause on having  
19 custodians from the development and the president's office  
20 right now.

21 Here's what that means for the defendants. I want to  
22 make it real clear what that means for the defendants. Okay?  
23 What that means is if I later determine that there's a basis  
24 to include those for some or all of the defendants, you're not  
25 going to get a whole lot of time to produce the stuff, and

1 you're not going to get to do it at anybody's leisure. It's  
2 going to be my definition of how quick you get it done. So  
3 that's the condition.

4 I don't have any more time to give you folks today.  
5 I got to start in three minutes an argument about patents and  
6 computer processors, which is going to make this look like a  
7 discussion of an action movie by comparison.

8 MR. MORSCH: Your Honor, James Morsch, on behalf of  
9 Duke. I just want to give your Honor advance notice of  
10 something that wasn't on the agenda today. The defendants  
11 filed an extension -- for an extension of the structured data  
12 deadline that was filed as item 313.

13 THE COURT: That got filed yesterday. That just got  
14 filed yesterday. I saw something got filed.

15 MR. MORSCH: Yes, that's a little bit time sensitive.

16 THE COURT: Hang on. Stop, stop, stop, stop, stop,  
17 stop, stop. I'm just pulling it up. It will just take a  
18 second for it to come up here.

19 Here it is. You're asking to extend the structured  
20 data deadline to March the 13th.

21 MR. MORSCH: That's right.

22 THE COURT: Do the plaintiffs have a problem with it?

23 MR. GILBERT: Yes, your Honor. We're going to file a  
24 brief --

25 THE COURT: No, you're not. No, no, no.

1 MR. GILBERT: We'll file an opposition in two days.

2 THE COURT: No. You're going to tell me right now  
3 what the problem with it is.

4 MR. GILBERT: The problem is, number one, it's not  
5 accurate. It misrepresents what was represented to the  
6 defendants.

7 Second is its meritless; that is, the anonymization  
8 could have started on November 22nd. The first we even heard  
9 there was a problem was on February 3rd. The first time it  
10 was explained was two days ago. Our experts have said this  
11 can be done much faster. Essentially, they've presented a  
12 fait accompli to the Court, basically telling the Court, this  
13 is the way it's going to be. They're violating two deadlines,  
14 not one. It requires them to violate also the deadline on  
15 March 3rd, which is court ordered. Okay? Which they don't  
16 mention --

17 THE COURT: What's that deadline? What's on March  
18 3rd?

19 MR. GILBERT: That is for the substantial response to  
20 all RFPs, many of which are structured data. So now there's  
21 two deadlines they're blowing.

22 And we're prejudiced. In order to get the number of  
23 depositions done in this case, we had indeed -- indeed hired  
24 additional people -- to start the depositions in mid April so  
25 we could get done by the beginning of next year, which is,

1 again, the court deadline. And our ability to start the  
2 depositions in mid April has been prejudiced.

3 So for all of those reasons, we oppose the motion.  
4 And they have not even said there's going to be a rolling  
5 production is another thing. We were told there would be a  
6 rolling motion. All they said is in the motion was there was  
7 going to be data in a month.

8 THE COURT: Stop on that. Stop on that.

9 And, Mr. Morsch, you brought this up, so I'm hereby  
10 appointing you the spokesperson. So if I give you an  
11 extension, is it going to be -- pardon me one second here --  
12 is it going to be a dump on that date, or is it going to be  
13 rolling production between now and then?

14 MR. MORSCH: It's going to be a rolling production,  
15 as we stated in the motion itself.

16 THE COURT: You get three weeks, not four. It's  
17 extended to the 6th of March.

18 MR. MORSCH: Thank you, your Honor.

19 One other thing. Item 2, which you talked about, the  
20 depositions, there was a little bit of a stun silence you may  
21 have seen when you raised that issue. You issued an order on  
22 February 12th.

23 THE COURT: Okay. Good, then. Never mind.

24 MR. MORSCH: Did you mean to revisit that order?

25 THE COURT: I didn't.

1 MR. MORSCH: Okay. Thank you, your Honor.

2 THE COURT: If I already ruled on it -- hey, I got a  
3 lot of stunned silences during this thing, so I can't really  
4 read much into it, other than the sound doesn't work that  
5 well. So it's not my intention to revisit the order. I just  
6 thought that was still on the table.

7 I got to end this, folks, because, as you can see,  
8 I'm having a hard time even talking.

9 MR. GILBERT: Your Honor, I apologize. But there's  
10 two reasons I need to address from the hearing commission.

11 THE COURT: I got to this end this now. I got to  
12 this end this now. The hearing is concluded. File something  
13 else. I don't want to have to go through the 469 pages again  
14 or whatever it was. The hearing is concluded.

15 Thanks. Bye.

16 (Which were all the proceedings had in the above-entitled  
17 cause on the day and date aforesaid.)

18 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from  
19 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

20 /s/ Carolyn R. Cox, CSR, RPR, F/CRR February 9, 2023  
21 Official Court Reporter  
22 United States District Court  
23 Northern District of Illinois  
24 Eastern Division  
25